UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,659	01/08/2002	Cory Isaacson	0SRC-086419	9405

30764   7590   04/19/2005

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET
48TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-1448

EXAMINER
NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/044,659	ISAACSON, CORY
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*15 November 2004*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 November 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed November 15, 2004.

2.   Claims 1-13 remain pending.

Response to Amendments

3.   In view of applicant's filing of a newly executed Declaration that includes the inventor's current post office address, the objection to the Declaration is hereby withdrawn.

4.   In view of Applicant' s amendments to the drawings to provide adequate left margin, the objection to the drawings is withdrawn.

5.   In view of Applicant' s amendments to the abstract of the disclosure to remove identified legal phraseology, the objection to the Abstract is withdrawn.

6.   In view of Applicant' s amendments to the claims to correct minor informalities, the objection to these claims is withdrawn.

7.   In view of Applicant's amendments to claim 3 to provide proper antecedent basis to the identified term, the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.

8.   In view of Applicant' s amendments to claims 1-13 to direct the claimed invention to statutory subject matter, the rejection of these claims and their dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed November 15, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Following is the Examiner's response to Applicant's arguments.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 13 based on the Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA):

Applicant's argument:

... However, the AAPA fails to teach or suggest a "Module," as required by amended independent claims 1, 6, and 10. For this reason, Applicant submits that the § 102 rejection of amended independent claims 1, 6, and 10, and dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 13, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Examiner's response:

The Examiner notes that while the claimed limitation "Module" is interpreted in light of the disclosure, limitations of the "Module" described in the disclosure should not be read into the independent claims for art rejection purposes. Even assuming that the "Module" should be read according to the description in the disclosure (section 11 of instant disclosure), the Examiner maintains that the application server layer described in Applicant's background is equivalent to and performs the same functions claimed for the "Module" as follows:

Claimed limitations (section 11)	Limitations in AAPA (section 4)
Module is in effect a virtual software object	Application Server Layer
Module to support all facets of entire business application process	provides all processing of business application data... performing required business logic... updating or retrieving business transaction data from back-end data sources.

provides unsurpassed flexibility for design of the user interface, as any required data which is defined as part of the Module can be presented to or captured from the user...	including processing user input from User Presentation Layer

Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by AAPA is proper and maintained.

The rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 based on the AAPA and the Branson Patent:

Applicant's arguments:

Also, the Branson patent *fails* to teach or suggest a "Module," as required by amended independent claims 1, 6, and 10, and thus, dependent claims 4, 4, 7, 8, and 11. Accordingly, neither the AAPA nor the Branson patent, nor the combination of the AAPA and Branson patent, teach or suggest the requirements of amended independent claims 1, 6, and 10, or dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11. For these reasons, Applicant submits that the § 103 rejection of dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Examiner's response:

As discussed above, the Examiner maintains that at least the AAPA teaches the "Module," as required by the amended independent claims 1, 6 and 10. Since claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 depend from claims 1, 6 and 10 respectively, these claims also incorporate subject matters of the independent claims. Additionally, the limitations of claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 are obvious over the AAPA in view of the Branson patent for the reasons discussed in the previous Office action and repeated hereinafter for Applicant's convenience.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by AAPA and the rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of the Branson patent are considered proper and maintained.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

11.   Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) discussed in Applicant's Background of the Invention.

Claim 1

AAPA discloses at least:

a browser which manages a user presentation interface for said business application, the browser configured to support client side scripting (see at least section [3], i.e., User Presentation Layer, in Applicants' Background of the Invention); and

an application server coupled to the browser (see at least section [4], i.e., Application Server Layer, in Applicants' Background of the Invention) *and having:*

a Module Controller Servlet for opening, closing and managing at

least one Module associated with the business application (see at least section [4], e.g., "… an application server which provides all processing of business application data…data sources." in Applicants' Background of the Invention), *said Module including:*

at least one Extension component which is selected from a plurality of Extension components, each Extension component defining at least one particular business method/ function associated with the business application, said Extension component invoked as required by the business application (see at least section [6], e.g., "one or more individual software components…respond to user events, perform business logic processing…" in Applicants' Background of the Invention), *and*

a Data Store having at least one associated data set which is selected from a plurality of data sets containing data associated with the business application (see at least section [5], i.e., Data Source Layer in Applicants' Background of the Invention); *and*

a server-side script processing engine for processing scripts submitted by the browser (see at least sections [4], [6] in Applicants' Background of the Invention).

Claim 6

Claim 6 recites a computer program product including computer readable program code for causing the same software components of claim 1 to perform the same functions recited in claim 1. Therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 10

Claim 10 recites a dynamic self-configurable module comprising the same data store claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claims 2, 9 and 12

The rejection of base claims 1, 6 and 10 respectively is incorporated. AAPA further discloses *wherein the Module modifies the at least one data set associated with the Data Store as a user makes changes to data associated with the business application via the user presentation interface* (see at least section [4] in Applicants' Background of the Invention).

Claims 3 and 13

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 10 respectively is incorporated. AAPA further discloses *wherein the Data Store further includes a Data Source Module which interacts with the at least one data set and transfers modifications to the data set to a back-end database* (see at least sections [4], [5], [6] in Applicants' Background of the Invention).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, as applied to the base claims in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,874 to Branson et al. ("Branson").

Claims 4 and 7

The rejection of base claims 1 and 6 is incorporated. AAPA does not specifically disclose *wherein the at least one Module associated with the business application*

further includes a Module Deployment Descriptor which defines the at least one associated data set which has been selected for the Data Store. However, Branson teaches a configuration process to define methods and data necessary for processing an order (15:24-41). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Branson teaching to define associated data set to be selected for the Data Store because Branson teaching would help minimizing the time and effort involved in customizing business application programs.

Claims 5 and 8

The rejection of claim 1 and 6, 7 respectively is incorporated. AAPA does not specifically disclose *wherein the Module Deployment Descriptor further defines which of the at least one Extension component is selected from the plurality of Extension components for inclusion in the Data Store.* However, Branson teaches a configuration process to define methods and data necessary for processing an order (15:24-41). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Branson teaching to define which Extension component to select for inclusion in the Data Store because Branson teaching would help minimizing the time and effort involved in customizing business application programs.

Claim 11

The rejection of base claim 10 is incorporated. AAPA does not specifically disclose *wherein the Module invokes a thread or instance to a Script Processing Engine in order to process the at least one business method/function of the at least one Extension component at runtime.* However, Branson teaches an object-oriented framework mechanism for order processing. Branson's order processing framework includes core classes that define the core function of the framework mechanism and extensible classes that are defined

by a user to implement a desired order-processing environment. See Abstract and Figures 11A-C and related discussion in the specification. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Branson teaching to process an order from the user (e.g., Figure 11C, invoking the processOrder() method) because the use of Branson teaching would help reduce time and effort involved in the customization of business application programs.

Conclusion

14.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7:15 – 17:45.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached at (571) 272-3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2192

April 13, 2005